UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,680	02/07/2001	Isao Okawa	Q62866	3339

7590   04/15/2005

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN
MACPEAK & SEAS
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER
LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _14 October 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-32_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-32_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The amendment filed 10/14/2004 has been placed of record in the file.

2.   Claims 1-32 have been amended.

3.   Claims 1-32 are now pending.

4.   The applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-32 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive. A detailed discussion is set forth below.

Response to Amendment

5.   Claims 1-32 have been amended in order to more clearly define the invention. Although

the amendments may provide a change in scope to the limitations of the claims, none of the

amended claims show a patentable distinction over the prior art of record. Since the claims have

been amended, a restatement of the rejections with the claims as amended follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7.   Claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31, and 32 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by DeSimone et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,212,548), hereinafter referred to as

DeSimone.

8.   Some claims will be discussed together. Those claims which are essentially the same

except that they set forth the claimed invention as a method or recording medium are rejected

under the same rationale applied to the described claim.

9.   DeSimone has disclosed:

* <Claims 11, 27, and 31>

    A communication system comprising a server device and a plurality of client devices

    connected through a network and allowing mutual communications among a plurality of

    users of respective client devices (column 4, lines 39-56), the server device having: a

    profile storing unit which stores first identification information preliminarily given to a

    user for identifying said user in the network, second identification information

    preliminarily given to said user for identifying said user in the communication system,

    and permit information relating to approval or disapproval of use of a specific service by

    said user, and being information stored at least corresponding to the first identification

    information (column 15, lines 20-27); and a validation processing unit which extracts the

    permit information corresponding to the first identification information from the profile

    storing unit when the first identification information and second identification

    information are presented from the client device and a request for use of a specific

    service is presented from the client device, and judges approval or disapproval of a

    presentation of said specific service to the client device on the basis of said permit

    information and the request for use presented from the client device (column 15, lines 28-

    36).

- <Claims 12, 28, and 32>

  A communication system comprising a server device and a plurality of client devices

  connected through a network and allowing mutual communications among a plurality of

  users of respective client devices (column 4, lines 39-56), the server device having: a

  profile storing unit which stores first identification information preliminarily given to a

  user for identifying the user in the communication system, and an arbitrary handle name

  of the user corresponding to the identification information (column 5, lines 40-54); and

  an ID converting unit which extracts the handle name corresponding to the identification

  information from the profile storing unit when the identification information is presented

  from one client device and use of a specific service relating to another client device is

  requested, and converts the identification information into said handle name (column 6,

  lines 57-64).

- <Claim 23>

  A server device connected to plural client devices through a network for allowing mutual

  communications among a plurality of users of respective client devices (column 4, lines

  39-56), the server device comprising: a profile storing unit which stores first

  identification information preliminarily given to a user for identifying said user in the

  network, second identification information preliminarily given to said user for identifying

  said user in the communication system, and permit information relating to approval or

  disapproval of use of a specific service by said user, and being the information stored at

  least corresponding to the first identification information (column 15, lines 20-27); and a

  validation processing unit which extracts the permit information corresponding to the

first identification information from the profile storing unit when the first identification

information and second identification information are presented from the client device

and a request for use of a specific service is presented from the client device, and judges

approval or disapproval of a presentation of said specific service to the client device on

the basis of said permit information and the request for use presented from the client

device (column 15, lines 28-36).

- <Claim 24>

  A server device connected to plural client devices through a network for allowing mutual

  communications among a plurality of users of respective client devices (column 4, lines

  39-56), the server device comprising: a profile storing unit which stores first

  identification information preliminarily given to a user for identifying said user in the

  communication system, and an arbitrary handle name of the user, said identification

  information and arbitrary handle name being stored with a relationship to each other

  (column 5, lines 40-54); and an ID converting unit which extracts the handle name

  corresponding to the identification information from the profile storing unit when the

  identification information is presented from one client device and use of a specific

  service relating to another client device is requested, and converts the identification

  information depending on said handle name (column 6, lines 57-64).

Since all the limitations of the invention as broadly set forth in claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31,

and 32 were disclosed by DeSimone, claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31, and 32 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 1-4, 6-9, 13-16, 18-21, 25, 26, 29, and 30 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over DeSimone in view of Grimm et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,828,843),

hereinafter referred to as Grimm.

12.   DeSimone disclosed a client-server message processing environment where a plurality of

users communicate in a plurality of real-time text converstations. In an analogous art, Grimm

disclosed a network match making system for matching users of a multi-user networked

application. He explicitly points out that an example of such an application is an online chat

environment. See column 1, lines 17-20. It is evident that Grimm's match making system is

meant to function in an environment such as that of DeSimone's invention.

13.   Although DeSimone did not explicitly state that his system could automatically match

users based on client attributes, Grimm taught a network match making system that would

accomplish this. Since the inventions could readily be used together as noted above, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to

modify the system provided by DeSimone by adding the match making capabilities as provided

by Grimm. This would strengthen DeSimone's chat environment by efficiently bringing

together groups of users. See Grimm, inter alia, column 1, lines 20-23.

14.   Thereby, the combination of DeSimone and Grimm discloses:

- <Claims 1, 25, and 29>

  A communication system comprising a server device and a plurality of client devices

  connected through a network and allowing mutual communications among a plurality of

  users of respective client devices (DeSimone, column 4, lines 39-56), the server device

  having: a matching unit which selects a candidate user for participation in a chat

  according to a specified standard, and transmits information about said candidate user to

  a client device (Grimm, column 2, lines 1-9); and a chat processing unit which transmits

  specified information for starting a chat, when start of a chat is requested by receipt of

  user identification information from one client device specifying at least one selected

  user, to the client device of each said selected user, and the one client device issuing said

  request (DeSimone, column 6, line 40 through column 8, line 57), and each of the client

  device having, a user selecting unit for specifying at least a portion of said plurality of

  users and generating said user identification information specifying at least one selected

  user (DeSimone, column 6, lines 40-64); and a display unit which displays a region for

  chat on the basis of said specified information when said specified information for

  starting a chat is transmitted from the server device (DeSimone, column 6, line 40

  through column 8, line 57).

- <Claim 2>

  The communication system according to claim 1, wherein the matching unit of the server

  device selects a user of another client devices to which information has most recently

  been transmitted that is the same as information that has been transmitted to the one

  client device most recently, among the users of the client devices for which a connection

currently is established (Grimm, column 3, lines 45-53 and column 6, line 15 through column 7, line 18).

- <Claim 3>

  The communication system according to claim 1, wherein the matching unit of the sever device selects a user, which has been preliminarily registered as a user having a specific relation by the users of each client device, among the users of the client devices for which a connection currently is established (DeSimone, column 14, line 62 through column 15, line 1).

- <Claim 4>

  The communication system according to claim 1, wherein the matching unit of the sever device organizes the selected users according to a specified standard (DeSimone, column 5, lines 15-27).

- <Claims 6, 26, and 30>

  A communication system comprising a server device and a plurality of client devices connected through a network and allowing mutual communications among a plurality of users of respective client devices (DeSimone, column 4, lines 39-56), the server device having, a matching unit which selects a candidate user as a destination for a transmission of a message having a message content according to a specified standard, and transmits information about said candidate user to a client device (Grimm, column 2, lines 1-9); and a message processing unit which transmits the message content to a client device of each specified user, when a request for message transmission is generated and the message content is specified by one client device (DeSimone, column 6, line 40 through

column 8, line 57), and each of the client devices having, a user selecting unit for

specifying at least a portion of said plurality of users as the specified user and generating

said request for message transmission (DeSimone, column 6, lines 40-64); and an output

unit which issues a specified output, when the message content is transmitted from the

server device, so that at least a presence of the message content is recognized by a user of

the client device (DeSimone, column 6, line 40 through column 8, line 57).

- <Claim 7>

The communication system according to claim 6, wherein the matching unit of the server

device selects a user of another client device, to which information has most recently

been transmitted that is the same as information that has been transmitted to the one

client device most recently, among the users of the client devices for which a connection

currently is established (Grimm, column 3, lines 45-53 and column 6, line 15 through

column 7, line 18).

- <Claim 8>

The communication system according to claim 6, wherein the matching unit of the sever

device selects the user preliminarily registered as having specific relation by the users of

each client device, among the users of the client devices for which a connection currently

is established (DeSimone, column 14, line 62 through column 15, line 1).

- <Claim 9>

The communication system according to claim 6, wherein the matching unit of the sever

device organizes the selected users according to a specified standard (DeSimone, column

5, lines 15-27).

- <Claim 13>

  A server device connected to plural client devices through a network for allowing mutual communications among a plurality of users of respective client devices (DeSimone, column 4, lines 39-56), the server device comprising: a matching unit which selects a candidate user for participation in a chat according to a specified standard, and transmits information about said candidate user to a client device (Grimm, column 2, lines 1-9); and a chat processing unit which transmits specified information for starting a chat, when a request for start of a chat is received from one client device specifying selected users, (1) to the client device of said candidate user, and (2) the one client device issuing said request (DeSimone, column 6, line 40 through column 8, line 57).

- <Claim 14>

  The server device according to claim 13, wherein the matching unit of the server device selects a user of another client devices to which information has most recently been transmitted that is the same as information that has been transmitted to the one client device most recently, among the users of the client devices for which a connection currently is established (Grimm, column 3, lines 45-53 and column 6, line 15 through column 7, line 18).

- <Claim 15>

  The server device according to claim 13, wherein the matching unit selects a user, which has been preliminarily registered as a user having specific relation by the users of each client device, among the users of the client devices for which a connection currently is established (DeSimone, column 14, line 62 through column 15, line 1).

- <Claim 16>

   The server device according to claim 13, wherein the matching unit organizes the

   selected users according to a specified standard (DeSimone, column 5, lines 15-27).

- <Claim 18>

   A server device connected to plural client devices through a network for allowing mutual

   communications among a plurality of users of respective client devices (DeSimone,

   column 4, lines 39-56), the server device comprising: a matching unit which selects a

   candidate user as a destination for a transmission of a message having a message content

   according to a specified standard, and transmits information about said candidate user to

   a client device (Grimm, column 2, lines 1-9); and a message processing unit which

   transmits the message content to a client device of each specified user, when a request for

   message transmission is generated and the message content is specified by one client

   device (DeSimone, column 6, line 40 through column 8, line 57).

- <Claim 19>

   The server device according to claim 18, wherein the matching unit of the server device

   selects a user of another client device, to which information has most recently been

   transmitted that is the same as information that has been transmitted to the one client

   device most recently, among the users of the client devices for which a connection

   currently is established (Grimm, column 3, lines 45-53 and column 6, line 15 through

   column 7, line 18).

- <Claim 20>

    The server device according to claim 18, wherein the matching unit selects the user

    preliminarily registered as having specific relation by the users of each client device,

    among the users of the client devices for which a connection currently is established

    (DeSimone, column 14, line 62 through column 15, line 1).

- <Claim 21>

    The server device according to claim 18, wherein the matching unit organizes the

    selected users according to a specified standard (DeSimone, column 5, lines 15-27).

Since the combination of DeSimone and Grimm discloses all of the above limitations, claims 1-

4, 6-9, 13-16, 18-21, 25, 26, 29, and 30 are rejected.

15.   Claims 5, 10, 17, and 22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over the combination of DeSimone and Grimm, as applied above, in view of Morris et al. (U.S.

Patent Number 6,496,851), hereinafter referred to as Morris.

16.   The combination of DeSimone and Grimm disclosed a client-server message processing

environment that could automatically match users. In an analogous art, Morris disclosed a

similar system for an online chat. His system allows users to agree on a mutually acceptable

communication ahead of time. See column 3, lines 36-42.

17.   Although the combination of DeSimone and Grimm did not explicitly state that the

system could reject a request for communication, Morris taught a system which could make

rejections. Since the inventions encompass the same field of endeavor, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the

combination of DeSimone and Grimm by adding the ability to reject requests as provided by

Morris. This would make sense since Morris's invention would allow for a smoother chatting

environment.

18.   Thereby, the combination of DeSimone, Grimm, and Morris discloses:

- <Claim 5>

  The communication system according to claim 1, wherein the server device further

  comprises a validation processing unit which rejects requests of a specific processing,

  when a specific processing is requested from one client device to another client device, if

  the user of the one client device has been already registered as having a specific relation

  by the user of said another client device (Morris, column 4, lines 35-41).

- <Claim 10>

  The communication system according to claim 6, wherein the server device further

  comprises a validation processing unit which rejects a request for a specific processing,

  when a specific processing is requested from one client device to another client device, if

  the user of the one client device already has been registered as having a specific relation

  by the user of said another client device (Morris, column 4, lines 35-41).

- <Claim 17>

  The server device according to claim 13 further comprising a validation processing unit

  which rejects request of a specific processing, when a specific processing is requested

  from one client device to another client device, if the user of the one client device has

  been already registered as having a specific relation by the user of said another client

  device (Morris, column 4, lines 35-41).

- <Claim 22>

  The server device according to claim 18 further comprising a validation processing unit

  which rejects a request for a specific processing, when a specific processing is requested

  from one client device to another client device, if the user of the one client device already

  has been registered as having a specific relation by the user of said another client device

  (Morris, column 4, lines 35-41).

Since the combination of DeSimone, Grimm, and Morris discloses all of the above limitations,

claims 5, 10, 17, and 22 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

19.   In the remarks, the applicant has argued:

- <Argument 1>

  DeSimone does not disclose all of the features of claim 11 and related independent

  claims.

- <Argument 2>

  DeSimone does not disclose all of the features of claim 12 and related independent

  claims.

- <Argument 3>

  The combination of DeSimone and Grimm does not disclose all of the features of claim 1

  and related independent claims.

- <Argument 4>

    The combination of DeSimone and Grimm does not disclose all of the features of claim 6

    and related independent claims.

- <Argument 5>

    The combination of DeSimone and Grimm is based on hindsight.

20.   In response to argument 1, DeSimone does disclose the features as recited in claim 11

and related independent claims. Regarding the use of network and system ID information and

permit information in DeSimone's system, the previous line citations, column 15, lines 20-36,

clearly show a first identification information for identifying the user in the network ("message

originator's ID"), a second identification information for identifying the user in the

communication system ("conversation ID"), and permit information ("pre-agreed security or

interest criteria"). Furthermore, it is clear that the permit information is stored since it is "pre-

agreed" security information. Also, it must correspond to the first identification information

because after satisfying the permit information, future received messages with the same

conversation ID and originator ID are freely directed to the appropriate chat windows. See

column 15, lines 37-40.

21.   Regarding the extraction step, it has been stated that the permit information is security

information previously agreed upon and thus stored. The delineation of extracting the permit

information in the claims is not patentably distinct as the information must be extracted, or read

from storage, in order for DeSimone's system to decide whether or not the criteria are met. Here

the specific service would be the online chat between the clients that is being set up with the

validation of the permit information.

22.   In response to argument 2, DeSimone does disclose the features as recited in claim 12

and related independent claims. As the applicant notes, the system of DeSimone utilizes a

combination of a sender's ID and a conversation index. These pieces of information meet the

limitations of the claims as an arbitrary handle name ("sender's ID" which can be a nickname)

and a communication system identification information ("unique conversation index").

DeSimone's system works by using the conversation index in order to determine to which

conversations the messages sent back and forth between clients belong. The system extracts the

handle name (or nickname) corresponding to the identification information (or conversation

index) and converts identification information into a handle name as stated in the claims. Thus

the system knows to which conversation each message belongs. Examples of chat displays from

this implementation can be found in figures 4 and 5.

23.   In response to argument 3, the combination of DeSimone and Grimm does disclose the

features as recited in claim 1 and related independent claims. The combination utilizes the fact

that DeSimone's chat system uses a configuration involving terminals connected to one or more

servers (see DeSimone, column 4, lines 4-18) and Grimm's match making process runs on a

server (see Grimm, column 2, lines 43-54) which is analogous to a server of DeSimone's system.

It is unclear what exactly the applicant is arguing in the sentence "Finally, Applicants submit that

there is no teaching…applied in the DeSimone system." as these limitations were rejected based

on citations to DeSimone. The applicant has simply stated that neither reference teaches these

limitations, however, the previous line citation (DeSimone, column 6, line 40 through column 8,

line 57) clearly shows the initiation of a chat when a server contacts designated recipients. The

recipients can be input by a client who wants to initiate the chat, as is the case in the citation

from DeSimone, or additionally they can be chosen by the server in a match making process as evidenced by Grimm. However, the part of claim 1 and the related independent claims that this argument seems to be addressing is the initiation of a chat by client input, which is clearly disclosed by DeSimone. In the claims, it seems as though the client may possibly input a candidate user selected by the matching unit for initiation of the chat, though this is not explicit. However, even if this was a specific limitation, the combination would still disclose it as Grimm discloses selecting a candidate user based on a match making process and DeSimone discloses the entering of recipients in order to initiate a chat session.

24.   In response to argument 4, the combination DeSimone and Grimm does disclose the features as recited in claim 6 and related independent claims. Similarly to argument 3, it can be shown that Grimm discloses a matching unit as recited in the claims. The previous line citation (Grimm, column 2, lines 1-9) summarily shows that Grimm's system selects a candidate user for being matched in communication with another client. For specific examples of how the system matches users, the applicant is directed to figures 2-6 which show how attributes are checked and the flow of requests and replies between the clients and the match making server. Furthermore, DeSimone clearly shows a processing unit which initiates a chat wherein a client device generates a message to be distributed to other clients, via a server. Again see DeSimone, column 6, line 40 through column 8, line 57.

25.   In response to argument 5 that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed

invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's

disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170

USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

26.   Here the combination utilizes the fact that DeSimone's chat system uses a configuration

involving terminals connected to one or more servers and Grimm's match making process runs

on a server that can be considered analogous to a server of DeSimone's system, as discussed

above. DeSimone's system is a multi-user online chat application and Grimm's system helps

solve a problem of these applications by providing an efficient way to bring together groups of

users. See Grimm, column 1, lines 20-23, as cited in the previous action. Clearly, the systems of

DeSimone and Grimm are analogous and the motivation behind the combination was within the

level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made. Thus the combination is

clearly not based upon improper hindsight reasoning.

27.   Regarding the arguments in general, the applicant has several times referred to a "passive

user." It is worth noting that the terminology "passive user" is not clearly defined or even

referred to in the claims. The applicant is reminded that although the claims are interpreted in

light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In

re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

28.   The applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this

office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). The

applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

29.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Victor Lesniewski whose telephone number is 571-272-3987.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Victor Lesniewski
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2155

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER